

From: [Jeanne Briskin](#)
To: [Fred Hauchman](#)
Subject: Re: Chesapeake
Date: 08/15/2012 03:54 PM

(b) (5)

Jeanne Briskin
Office of Science Policy
Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (8104R)
Washington, D.C. 20460
(202) 564-4583 - office
(202) 565-2911 - fax
briskin.jeanne@epa.gov

Address for Deliveries:
US EPA
Ronald Reagan Building --Room 51144
Washington DC 20004

▼ [Fred Hauchman](#)---08/15/2012 03:42:14 PM-- (b) (5)

From: Fred Hauchman/DC/USEPA/US
To: Jeanne Briskin/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/15/2012 03:42 PM
Subject: Re: Chesapeake

(b) (5)

▼ [Jeanne Briskin](#)

----- Original Message -----

From: Jeanne Briskin
Sent: 08/15/2012 02:55 PM EDT
To: Bob Sussman
Cc: Dayna Gibbons; Lek Kadeli; Ramona Trovato; Michael Overbay; Fred Hauchman; Cynthia Sonich-Mullin; David Jewett; Ann Campbell
Subject: Re: Chesapeake

Hi Bob,

You were interested in the status of our prospective case study with Chesapeake

1. Resolution of technical and legal issues

A. A couple of weeks ago, we thought we had resolved all remaining issues and were poised to proceed with the prospective case study with Chesapeake. However, after the last meeting with EPA and Chesapeake, Chesapeake's attorney added text back into the access agreement to request that E&E provide indemnification in case the monitoring well damages Chesapeake's production well. E&E responded that this is specifically excluded from their insurance, but they are

checking to confirm this. Steve Hess, OGC is aware of this development.

B. At the last meeting, Chesapeake said they would remove their request for well control insurance. They did not provide this in writing, but neither did they object when the relevant text was changed to remove this requirement. (b) (5)

C. In the meantime, EPA is making plans to begin the groundwater characterization work (flow rates and direction)

We are unable to proceed in the field until the insurance issue is resolved.

2. Desk Statement approval

On 8/10, I sent to John Satterfield the text EPA and Chesapeake (Stephanie Timmermeyer) and previously agreed to to serve as a desk statement and basis of an update to our website, to confirm that the text was still acceptable. John reported on 8/15 that the text is with Paul Hagemeier, (b) (5)

Our plan is to update our website and have a desk statement available (no press notification or note to correspondents, etc)

The previously agreed text is:

"Due to scheduling conflicts, the prospective case study of the hydraulic fracturing site near Mansfield in DeSoto Parish, Louisiana, will be replaced by an alternative site. Sampling to establish baseline conditions for the study could not be completed before drilling was to begin on the site. While it was not a factor in the decision to cancel this case study, the site was also not ideal for collection of certain baseline samples, due in part to the anticipated slow rate of groundwater flow. We have been working closely with Chesapeake Energy (our industry partner on this project) to identify a replacement site that meets the criteria for EPA's hydraulic fracturing study. A new site has been selected in Alfalfa County, Oklahoma.

Draft Questions and Answers

1. Why was the newly selected prospective case study site not in the Haynesville Shale area?

EPA was not able to replace this site with another one in the Haynesville Shale area because there were no available sites that satisfy our criteria while fitting into the schedules of both EPA and Chesapeake Energy. Therefore, we have worked with Chesapeake to evaluate potential replacement sites they have provided in areas where drilling activities remain high.

2. Why was the Alfalfa County site selected?

The site in Alfalfa County meets the technical considerations for a site which EPA had outlined as relevant to a prospective case study. This includes factors such as being in an area without significant pre-existing development,

and having relatively shallow depths to good quality groundwater. Additionally, the site schedule for development is compatible with the EPA schedule for investigation.

3. Will this delay results for the final Hydraulic Fracturing Report?

EPA intends to establish a schedule, in agreement with our industry partner, that would make results available in 2014."

Jeanne Briskin
Office of Science Policy
Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (8104R)
Washington, D.C. 20460
(202) 564-4583 - office
(202) 565-2911 - fax
briskin.jeanne@epa.gov

Address for Deliveries:
US EPA
Ronald Reagan Building --Room 51144
Washington DC 20004

▼ Bob Sussman---08/10/2012 04:39:07 PM---Thanks jeanne. ----- Original Message -----

From: Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US
To: Jeanne Briskin/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Dayna Gibbons/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lek Kadeli/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ramona Trovato/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/10/2012 04:39 PM
Subject: Re: Chesapeake

Thanks jeanne.

▼ Jeanne Briskin

----- Original Message -----

From: Jeanne Briskin
Sent: 08/10/2012 04:18 PM EDT
To: Bob Sussman
Cc: Dayna Gibbons; Lek Kadeli; Ramona Trovato
Subject: Re: Chesapeake

We're double checking desk statement text w/ John Satterfield, and I have asked Mike Overbay for a final assessment. Will let you know as soon as I hear from both.

Jeanne Briskin
Office of Science Policy
Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (8104R)
Washington, D.C. 20460
(202) 564-4583 - office
(202) 565-2911 - fax
briskin.jeanne@epa.gov

Address for Deliveries:
US EPA
Ronald Reagan Building --Room 51144
Washington DC 20004

▼ Bob Sussman---08/10/2012 03:53:22 PM-- (b) (5)

From: Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US
To: "Dayna Gibbons" <Gibbons.Dayna@epamail.epa.gov>, "Jeanne Briskin" <Briskin.Jeanne@epamail.epa.gov>
Cc: "Lek Kadel" <Kadel.Lek@epamail.epa.gov>, "Ramona Trovato" <Trovato.Ramona@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: 08/10/2012 03:53 PM
Subject: Chesapeake

(b) (5)